

**MINUTES OF  
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 2015**

PRESENT: Peter F. Murphy, Springfield District  
Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District  
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large  
Ellen J. Hurley, Braddock District  
John C. Ulfelder, Dranesville District  
James T. Migliaccio, Lee District  
Julie Strandlie, Mason District  
Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District  
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District  
John L. Litzenberger, Jr., Sully District  
Janyce N. Hedetniemi, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:16 p.m. by Chairman Peter F. Murphy in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

FSA-Y06-12-1 – T-MOBILE, 14280 Park Meadow Drive

Chairman Murphy: WITHOUT OBJECTION, I ALSO MOVE THE CONSENT AGENDA ITEM.

The motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Sargeant was absent from the meeting.

//

SEA 01-M-038-02 – CELLCO PARTNERSHIP d/b/a VERIZON WIRELESS; BROYHILL CREST RECREATION CLUB INC.

Commissioner Strandlie: I'D LIKE TO DEFER SEA 01-M-038-02, CELLCO PARTNERSHIP, DOING BUSINESS AS VERIZON WIRELESS; BROYHILL CREST RECREATION CLUB INC., TO MARCH 25<sup>TH</sup>, 2015.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Hedetniemi. Is there any discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Sargeant was absent from the meeting.

//

RZ/FDP 2002-MV-040 – SPRING HILL SENIOR CAMPUS

Commissioner Flanagan: Last night I indicated that the administrative review of the final development plan for the Spring Hill Senior Campus was going to be brought up tonight. In the meantime, that would give us time for me to submit to you all by email copies of the – of the original final development plan adopted in 2003 and the applicant's version of that that is now – the site plan awaiting approval by the Department of Public Works. And also I sent you a copy of the letter that the Public Works sent to Christopher Consultants in that regard and it indicates that the Planning Commission should review and comment upon that prior to the approval of that, so at this time I just would like to make – just to ask that the Planning Commission inform the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services that the Planning Commission agrees that the developer's site plan is substantially in accord with the conceptual development plan and the final development plan previously approved by the Planning Commission in 2003 if the sidewalks and landscaping north of the previous [*inaudible*] area as requested by the Spring Hill Senior Campus Homeowner Association is deleted.

Commissioner Litzenberger: Second.

Commissioner Flanagan: So, if anybody has any comments that you have in addition, why, we could add that to the letter to the Department of Public Works.

Chairman Murphy: Anyone?

Commissioner Lawrence: Mr. Lawrence?

Chairman Murphy: Yes.

Commissioner Lawrence: In recent times I have kind of had a different point of view about getting around and it led me to a question in looking at the interior views of note. The corridor – central corridor – is it wide enough for two chairs to meet in opposite directions and pass each other, given that there will be assist bars along the – the walls? Are we confident of that?

Commissioner Flanagan: That – I don't believe – the architectural review – we're of course limited to the site review.

Commissioner Lawrence: I understand.

Commissioner Flanagan: But the architectural review is being – is being heard tonight as we sit here by the Architectural Review Board and they are addressing those issues, and I agree with

you. I think that that's – we can note that in the letter that we send, that we are hopeful that that is adequate.

Commissioner Lawrence: I'm – I'm hopeful with... that.

Commissioner Flanagan: I'd be happy to put that in the letter that we send to DPWES.

Commissioner Lawrence: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you. Anyone else? Okay.

Commissioner Flanagan: That's it.

Chairman Murphy: That's it?

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes.

No motion was made.

//

SE 2014-MV-055 – NGOC MAI NGUYEN (Decision Only) (The public hearing on this application was held on February 25, 2015.)

Commissioner Flanagan: On February 25<sup>th</sup>, the Planning Commission heard testimony regarding a home child care facility Special Exception application 2014-MV-055. As a result of that public hearing, conditions have now been revised and dated February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2015, and been distributed to you this evening. so I move therefore that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors -

Chairman Murphy: Well, do you want to bring the applicant up here on the development conditions?

Commissioner Flanagan: Oh, that's right. I need to have the applicant come forward.

Chairman Murphy: Will the applicant please come forward and identify yourself for the record, and Mr. Flanagan will ask if you understand and agree with the development conditions.

Ngoc Mai Nguyen, Owner, My Little School: Good evening.

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes, the Commission needs you to affirm that – for the record that you agree to the proposed development conditions dated February 26, 2015.

Ms. Nguyen: Yes, I agree. I read, and I agree.

Commissioner Flanagan: Right, and you understand that you're still subject to the homeowner association requirements in regard to the child care.

Ms. Nguyen: Yes.

Commissioner Flanagan: Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: And would you please state your name and address for the record?

Ms. Nguyen: My name is Ngoc Mai Nguyen and my address is 7664 Henry Knox Drive, Lorton, Virginia, 22079.

Chairman Murphy: Okay, thank you very much.

Ms. Nguyen: Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: You can go back and sit down now. Thank you.

Commissioner Flanagan: Call the question?

Chairman Murphy: Yes. Please. Did you make the motion?

Commissioner Flanagan: I've already made the motion. I just didn't have a second.

Commissioner Litzenberger: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't hear. Mr. Litzenberger seconded the motion. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT APPROVE SE 2014-MV-055, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Hurley: I just want to abstain from that. I wasn't here.

Chairman Murphy: Okay, Ms. Hurley abstain on Mr. Flanagan's motion

The motion carried by a vote of 10-0-1. Commissioner Hurley abstained; Commissioner Sargeant was absent from the meeting.

//

SE 2014-DR-033 – KRISHNA R. MURTHY

Commissioner Ulfelder: I have a DEFERRAL OF A PUBLIC HEARING FOR SE 2014-DR-003 [sic], KRISHNA MURTHY, TO A NEW DATE OF APRIL 15<sup>TH</sup>, 2015.

Chairman Murphy: Is it -003?

Commissioner Ulfelder: -033.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Is there any discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion, say aye

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Sargeant was absent from the meeting.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hart established the following order of the agenda:

1. SE 2014-MA-069 – SEVEN CORNERS SHOPPING CENTER FALLS CHURCH, VA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

This agenda was accepted without objection.

//

SE 2014-MA-069 – SEVEN CORNERS SHOPPING CENTER FALLS CHURCH, VA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP – Appl. under Sect. 9-620 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit waiver of certain sign regulations. Located at 6270, 6290, and 6288 Arlington Blvd., Falls Church, on approx. 6.46 ac. of land zoned C-7, SC, CRD, and HC. Tax Map 51-3 ((1)) 35A and 35B. MASON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Sara Mariska, Esquire, Applicant's Agent, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley, Emrich & Walsh, PC, reaffirmed the affidavit dated January 20, 2015.

Commissioner Hart disclosed that his law firm, Hart & Horan, PC, had a pending case with Ms. Mariska's law firm in which there were attorneys representing an adverse party, but indicated that it would not affect his ability to participate in this case.

Sharon Williams, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that staff recommended approval of application SE 2014-MA-069.

Ms. Mariska noted that the building had been located on the site for quite some time and had recently had a number of façade improvements. She added that the proposed sign would enhance

those improvements. She noted that the applicant had originally proposed a much larger sign, but reduced it by request of county staff to 25 feet in height. She noted that the application had received the support of the Mason District Land Use Committee for a 30-foot sign. She stated that the applicant disagreed with staff's proposed 24-foot proposed height, noting that the extra foot would enhance its visibility along Route 50.

Commissioner Strandlie asked Ms. Mariska whether the number of tenants for the sign would change if the size changed. Ms. Mariska said it would not, adding that she was confident that all of the panels on the sign would be used.

Commissioner Strandlie referenced page 7 of the staff report and stated that she preferred Figure 9: Staff Recommendation, noting that it was more attractive and seemed less obtrusive than the applicant's proposal.

Ms. Mariska confirmed for Commissioner Ulfelder that the applicant requested that Development Condition Number 4 be modified to say 25 feet instead of 24.

Commissioner de la Fe asked Ms. Williams why a 24-foot sign was more preferable. Ms. Williams said that it was more in line with the existing surroundings.

Chairman Murphy pointed out that the area in which the sign was located was a busy commercial area with many signs; hence, the addition of one foot to this sign should not be an issue.

Commissioner Hart asked whether staff was steadfast in its decision regarding the 24-foot height of the sign. Ms. Williams said yes.

Commissioner Lawrence noted the applicant's voluntary decrease from a 30-foot high sign and asked Ms. Williams if the tenant signs were approximately 3 feet. She said yes, adding that that was the basis for the 24-foot sign height.

Commissioner Hurley asked Ms. Mariska if any tenant sign space was lost in reducing the overall height, to which Ms. Mariska said no. Ms. Mariska reiterated that Mason District Land Use Committee supported the application.

Commissioner Strandlie acknowledged that the Mason District Land Use Committee had agreed that the proposed sign would be a great improvement but questioned whether the committee had discussed the sign's height at length.

Commissioner Migliaccio asked whether the Seven Corner Revitalization Committee was included in any of the meetings regarding this application. Ms. Mariska said yes. She noted that after having heard their concerns, the applicant decided to follow the staff's suggestion to reduce the sign height from 30 feet.

Commissioner Ulfelder stated that he did not object to the applicant's proposed height. William O'Donnell, ZED, DPZ, stated that staff had worked diligently to arrive at the suggested sign

height of 24-feet and reiterated Ms. Johnson's earlier remarks regarding the suggested 24-foot sign height.

When Commissioner Ulfelder asked Ms. Mariska why the extra foot mattered, Ms. Mariska stated that the applicant had made a number of compromises and said that while one foot might not seem like much, given the location of the sign, any extra footage would provide better visibility for travelers along the corridor.

Commissioner Hedetniemi pointed out that the application was for a way-finding sign and stated that far too much time had been spent on one foot of height.

Commissioner Strandlie countered that while the extra foot might seem small, it would make the sign too large. She added that she would defer the application for a week

Commissioner Lawrence suggested that if there were to be a deferral, two things should be considered:

- relocate the sign so that travelers would see it sooner before turning into the shopping center, and
- add a sign saying, "Next Right" so that drivers in that lane would know to either stay and go to the shopping center or change lanes to go elsewhere.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience, but received no response. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Strandlie for action on this item.

//

Chairman Murphy: Public hearing is closed; Ms. Strandlie.

Commissioner Strandlie: I MOVE THAT PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR SE 2014-MA-069 TO A DATE CERTAIN OF MARCH 19<sup>TH</sup>.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Hedetniemi. Is there any discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer decision only SE 2014-MA-069 to a date certain of March 19<sup>th</sup> with the date - with the record remaining open for written comment, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Sargeant was absent from the meeting.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 8:51 p.m.  
Peter F. Murphy, Chairman  
James R. Hart, Secretary

Audio and video recordings of this meeting are available at the Planning Commission Office,  
12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 330, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

Minutes by: Jeanette Nord

Approved on: September 17, 2015



John W. Cooper, Clerk to the  
Fairfax County Planning Commission